

MEMBERS
JAMES M. CAMERON, JR.
CHAIRPERSON
CRAIG H. LUBBEN
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
SYLVIA P. WHITMER, Ph.D.
SECRETARY
ROSALIND E. GRIFFIN, M.D.
CARL E. VER BEEK
LAWRENCE G. CAMPBELL
DULCE M. FULLER
LOUANN VAN DER WIELE
MICHAEL MURRAY

STATE OF MICHIGAN
ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD



211 WEST FORT STREET, SUITE 1410
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-3236
PHONE: 313-963-5553 | FAX: 313-963-5571

MARK A. ARMITAGE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
—
WENDY A. NEELEY
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
—
SHERRY L. MIFSUD
OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR
—
JENNIFER M. PETTY
PARALEGAL
—
KATHLEEN PHILLIPS
CASE MANAGER
—
ALLYSON M. PLOURDE
CASE MANAGER
—
JULIE M. LOISELLE
RECEPTIONIST
—
www.adbmich.org

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION
(By Consent)

Case No. 13-84-RD

Notice Issued: April 1, 2014

Deborah Ross Adams, P 32519, Detroit, Michigan, by the Attorney Discipline Board Tri-County Hearing Panel #7.

1. Suspension - 180 Days
2. Effective March 31, 2014

The Judicial Tenure Commission (JTC), having found that respondent, a judge, had engaged in misrepresentations under oath; forged and filed unauthorized pleadings; and made misrepresentations to the commission while she was a defendant in a divorce matter, recommended that respondent be suspended for 180 days. The Michigan Supreme Court adopted the JTC's recommendation, in part, but instead ordered that respondent be removed from the bench for the remainder of her term.

Based on the June 19, 2013 order and opinion of the Michigan Supreme Court, the Grievance Administrator filed a request for discipline pursuant to MCR 9.120(C). Subsequently, the respondent and the Grievance Administrator filed a stipulation for a consent order of discipline, in accordance with MCR 9.115(F)(5), which was approved by the Attorney Grievance Commission and accepted by the hearing panel. The parties agreed that a 180-day suspension from the practice of law was comparable discipline under MCR 9.120(C). The parties further agreed that respondent was found to have knowingly made a false statement of material fact or law to a tribunal or failed to correct a false statement of material fact or law previously made to the tribunal, in violation of MRPC 3.3(a)(1); and failed to comply with a reasonable request made by the commission in its investigation, in violation of MCR 9.208(B). Respondent was also found to have violated MCR 9.104(A); and Canons 1 and 2 of the code of Judicial Conduct.

In accordance with the stipulation of the parties, the hearing panel ordered that respondent be suspended for 180 days, commencing March 31, 2014. Costs were assessed in the amount of 765.54.

Mark A. Armitage

APR - 1 2014

Dated: _____